arXiv:1605.08273v1 [math.GM] 25 May 2016

The novel reseraches toward the proof of the Goldbach's conjecture by the novel functions, the novel conjecture, the Riemann zeta function, and the novel experimental computations

Ahmad Sabihi[1]

Teaching professor and researcher at some universities of Iran

Abstract

In this paper, at first two new functions are given then three new functions are developed based on the first two functions. Using these functions accompanied by a novel method, we make a conjecture to prove "every even integer greater than 2 can be represented by the sum of two prime numbers".In order to make the proof, firstly a simple function as $h(n) = n - \Sigma_{j=0}^{k-1}(r_1^j)^2 + f(k)$ is made for each even integer n and is then extended as function $\hat{h}(n) = n - \Sigma_{j=0}^{k-1}\prod_{i=1}^{i=m}(r_i^j)^{x_i} + f(k)$ where $h(n)$ and $\hat{h}(n)$ denote evens whichever are equal to the sum of two primes. After this extending, it is proved that $\hat{h}(n)$ is a surjective and one to one function onto $2\mathbb{N} - \{2\}$,and is finally concluded where $\hat{h}(n)$ is an identity function from n to n.Hence every even integer > 2 as n will be the sum of two primes.During the proof, we prove an explicit formula for computing the number of primes in a certain interval by the Rie-

Email address: sabihi2000@yahoo.com (Ahmad Sabihi)

[1]Fourth Floor, Building 30, Poormehrabi Alley, Mofatteh St., Bozorgmehr Ave., Isfahan, Iran.

Published by Bull. Allahabad Math. Soc., Vol.25, Part 1, 2010

mann Zeta Function.This explicit formula is:
$\pi(x) = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(r)}{r} \left\{ Li(x^{\frac{1}{r}}) - \sum_{\gamma>0} \{ Li(x^{\frac{\rho}{r}}) + Li(x^{\frac{1-\rho}{r}}) \} + \int_{x^{\frac{1}{r}}}^{\infty} \frac{du}{u(u^2-1)(\log(u))} - 3.7277 \log 2 \right\}$
where denotes the number of primes less than or equal to x. $\mu(r)$ denotes the Möbius function,$Li(x) = \int_2^x \frac{du}{\log(u)}$,and $\rho = \beta + j\gamma$ denotes a zero of the Riemann Zeta Function. We then define a special sum on $\pi(n)$ where is called $sum(n) = n - 2\phi(n) - 2D(n) + 2 + 2\pi(n)$.Using $sum(n)$,the number of the primes are obtained by the new functions,$K(n,m)$,$L(n)$,and $M(n,m)$ on the primes.The functions $\hat{h}(n), sum(n), L(n), M(n,m)$ and $K(n,m)$ are called "Sabihi's functions". Here is also created a novel conjecture (Sabihi's conjecture) by the functions $K(N(k),m)$ and $L(N(k))$ where $N(k) = n - \Sigma_{j=0}^{k-2} \prod_{i=1}^{i=m} (r_i^j)^{x_i} + f(k) - 1$ and k denotes module of the function $\hat{h}(n)$. This conjecture shows that the function $N(k)$ is a one to one function.In this paper, we prove if $N(k) = n$,it will be sufficient to hold true the Sabihi's conjecture.Therefore,if it is true,then the Goldbach's Conjecture will be certainly proved.The new computer's programs have been written and run by Maple 8 and Matlab R2006a's softwares.These programs compute the even numbers from 120 to 100000 for the given conjecture.The graphs are also plotted only for the even numbers 120 to 20000.The results show good agreement and promising. Also, these programs show that the conjecture could be true for the even numbers greater than 100000 to infinity.

Keywords: Goldbach's conjecture; Riemann zeta function; Analytic number theory; Multivariate congruences; Hilbert's zeros theorem; N-dimensional affine spaces; Surjective function;One to one function; Sabihi's functions; Sabihi's conjecture

Mathematics Subject Classification:

11A07,11A41,11M26,11P32,11Y04,14J25

1. INTRODUCTION

The Goldbach's conjecture was first stated in 1742 in a letter written by Christian Goldbach to the great Swiss mathematician Leonard Euler. The Conjecture is popularly represented as the conjecture that "every even number greater than two is the sum of two primes".Although Euler spent much time trying to prove it, he never succeeded. For the next 266 years, other mathematicians would struggle in similar fashion. The proof has not been found to this day, and Goldbach's Conjecture is acknowledged to be one of the most notoriously difficult problems in all of mathematics.

The eponymous conjecture is a seemingly straightforward mathematical puzzle put forward by the Prussian historian and mathematician Christian Goldbach,who scribbled it in a letter to the famous mathematician Leonard Euler in 1742. The conjecture is believed to be true but-and this is the crucial bit-nobody has come up with an absolute proof that it is true for all numbers. As Goldbach wrote: " That every even number is a sum of two primes, I consider an entirely certain theorem in spite of that I am not able to demonstrate it."

Supercomputers can check the conjecture's veracity, but only up to a point. The last computing milestone that we know, it was around 2001, when the conjecture was found to hold true for every even number up to about 4×10^{14} [1]. But no amount of computing power could confirm it for every candidate number up to infinity.In this paper, we show that for every even number as n there may be a prime as P which is relatively prime

to n and inequality $n-(r_1^1)^2+1<P<n$ is satisfied.r_1^1 is the smallest relatively prime to n. If P there was in that interval, then $n-P$ would be prime,$n=P+n-P$ and the proof is completed, but if P there was not,we consider the other interval such as $n-(r_1^1)^2+1-(r_1^2)^2<P<n-(r_1^1)^2+1$ where r_1^2 is the smallest relatively prime to $n-(r_1^1)^2+1$ and is also an even number. This method will be continued until one finds a sample prime as the above and be able to establish the equation (1-1):

$$N=n-\sum_{j=0}^{j=k-1}(r_1^j)^2+f(k) \tag{1.1}$$

where N is also an even number.For example:let $n=60$ then r_1^1 and P should satisfy the inequality $60-7^2+1<P<60\Rightarrow 12<P<60$ thus, for every P which is prime with respect to 60 and locates in that interval,$60-P$ should be prime and $60=P+60-P$. There are examples similar to this for number 60 such as:$P_1=13,60-13=47,P_2=17,60-17=43,P_3=19,60-19=41,\ldots$. The other example is: $n=10000,r_1^1=3,\gcd(10000,3)=1,10000-3^2+1<P<10000\Rightarrow 9992<P<10000$. There isn't any prime in the above interval for $n=10000$, then the method should be continued to find the other prime in the other interval. Therefore $N=10000-3^2+1,r_1^2=3,gcd(N,r_1^2)=1,10000-3^2+1-3^2+1<P<9992\Rightarrow 9984<P<9992$.Again, we have an unsuccessful, then:$N=10000-3^2+1-3^2+1,r_1^3=5,gcd(N,r_1^3)=1,10000-3^2+1-3^2+1-5^2+1<P<9984\Rightarrow 9960<P<9984,\Rightarrow P=9967$.Obviously, 9967 is the prime and also prime relatively to 9984,therefore $9984=9967+17$ that both 9967 and 17 are the primes and we could finally find an even which is the sum of two prime numbers. Representation of the formula (1-1) to it is:$9984=10000-(3^2+3^2)+2$.Therefore,for $n=10000$

we found 9984 where is the sum of 9967 and 17,$N = 9984$,$r_1^1 = r_1^2 = 3$,$k = 3$,$f(3) = 2$

By using the techniques of additive number theory, one can obtain an upper bound for $E(x)$ the number of even integers less than x which are not the sum of two prime numbers. For example, van der Corput [2] showed that $E(x) = o(x)$ and later Vaughan [3] improved it to

$$E(x) = O\{x \exp(-\alpha\sqrt{\log(x)}\} \tag{1.2}$$

Heuristic arguments leads one to conjecture that $R_2(n)$ the number of representations of the even integer n as a sum of two primes satisfies

$$R_2(n) \sim A_0 \frac{n}{(\log(n))^2} \prod_{P>2, P|n} \frac{P-1}{P-2} \tag{1.3}$$

Where

$$A_0 = 2 \prod_{P>2} \{1 - \frac{1}{(P-1)^2}\} \tag{1.4}$$

Tur'an [4] has given an "explicit formula" for $R_2(n)$ in terms of n and the complex zeros of certain L-functions. The quantity $A_0 \frac{n}{(\log(n))^2} \prod_{P>2, P|n} \frac{P-1}{P-2}$ does occur in Tur'an's equation, but one can not as yet show that the other terms in the expression for $R_2(n)$ are of a lower order of magnitude.

In Section two,one will see the various Lemmas and their proofs which are elementary and the basic theory of the work. They form the structure of the next theories and will ready reader as "stepping stone" to the next sections. In this section, the function $h(n)$ is constructed. In Section three, the other Lemmas are expressed by their proofs, the function $h(n)$ is then extended as $\hat{h}(n)$ and its being surjective onto the $2\mathbb{N} - \{2\}$ is proved.In Section four, some proofs for $\Pi(x)$ and $\pi(x)$ are given by the Riemann Zeta Function, then

we gradually progress toward to obtain the function $K(n, m)$.A consequence from the function $K(n, m)$ and Sabihi's conjecture (Lemma 4.9) will show a one to one function for $\hat{h}(n)$.In Section five, the computerized programs will come which have been written by Maple 8 and Matlab R2006a. These programs have been run for the even numbers from 120 to 100000 which approve the new conjecture for these numbers.The plots have been drawn only for the evens 120 to 20000.A conclusions section of this paper and future work will be given for completing a general proof of the Goldbach's conjecture.

As said in the introduction, Goldbach in a letter to Euler proposed two conjectures on the representations of integers as the sum of primes. These conjectures with some modifications may be stated as follows: *1) Every even integer* ≥ 6 *is the sum of two odd primes. 2) Every odd integer* ≥ 9 *can be represented as the sum of three odd primes.* Clearly, the phrase 2) can be derived from phrase 1).In his letter to Goldbach, Euler expressed his belief in these statements, though he could not prove it (see Dichson [5]).It is shown that these two conjectures are correct by a lot of accumulated numerical calculations since Goldbach wrote his letter up to date, for example, Shen Mok Kong [6] has checked the conjecture 1) up to 33×10^6, and the further calculation up to 10^8 was made by Light, Forres, Hammond and Roe [7].

Hilbert proposed 23 problems for the mathematicians in the 20th century, and the conjecture 1) is a part of his 8th problem in his famous speech at 2nd International Congress of Mathematics held in Paris in 1900. In 1912, the conjecture 1) is regarded as one of the four famous unsolved problems in the theory of prime numbers proposed by Landau [8] in his speech at the 5th International Congress held in Cambridge. Furthermore, in his speech at

the mathematical society of Copenhagen in 1921, Hardy [9,10] pronounced that the conjecture 1) is *"probably as difficault as any of the unsolved problems in mathematics"* and therefore *Goldbach problem is not only one of the most famous and difficult problems in number theory, but also in the whole of mathematics.*There is no method to attack this problem and the research is confined only on checking the conjecture 1) by some numerical calculations or proposing some further conjectures on 1) since Goldbach wrote his letter up to 1920. (see Dickson [5], Hardy [9,10]).

The first great achievements on the study of Goldbach's problem were obtained in the 1920s.Using their "circle method", British mathematicians Hardy and Littlewood [11] *proved in 1923 that every sufficiently large odd integer is the sum of three odd primes and almost all even integers are sum of two primes if the grand Riemann hypothesis is assumed to be true.* Norwegian mathematician Brun [12,13] established in 1919 by his "sieve method" *that every large even number is the sum of two numbers each having at most nine prime factors.*In 1930, by using Brun's method with his own new idea, the "density" of integer sequence, Russian mathematician Schnirelmann [14]was the first who obtained a theorem in additive prime number theory, *namely every integer* ≥ 2 *is the sum of at most c primes,hereafter we use* $c, c_1, c_2, \ldots$ *to denote absolute constants, but not the same constants at different occurrences.*The study of Goldbach's problem has a tremendous and deep development for the past 72 years. In particular, in 1937, using the circle method and ingenious method on the estimation of exponential sum with prime variable, Russian mathematician I.M. Vinogradov [15] was able to remove the dependence on the grand Riemann hypothesis, thereby giving unconditional

proofs of the above two conclusions of Hardy and Littelewood. And after a series of important improvements on Brun's method and his result, Chinese mathematician Chen Jing Run [16,17] established in 1966 that every large even integer is the sum of a prime and a product of at most two primes.

We must mention that the breakthrough on the study of Goldbach's conjecture is clearly inseparable from the great achievements on analytic number theory in the 19 th century, in particular, the theory of C'ebys'ev, Dirichlet, Riemann, Hadamard, de la Valle'e Possin and von Mangoldt on the distribution of prime numbers. Some of the main ideas about Goldbach's Conjecture are:

A) The Circle method is a well-known method that has its genesis in a paper of Hardy and Ramanujan [18] in 1918 concerned with the partition function and the problem of representing numbers as the sums of squares.The two important theorems were proved by Linnik [19,20,21,22] using circle method where(1)for given integer $g > 1$ there exists $k_0 > 0$ such that for $k > k_0$ every large integer $\equiv kg(mod 2)$ can be represented by

$$n = P_1 + P_2 + g^{X_1} + \ldots + g^{X_k} \tag{1.5}$$

Where $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ are positive integers,and (2) under the assumption of Riemann Hypothesis (RH) for any given integer $n > 1$ there exist P_1, P_2 such that

$$|n - P_1 + P_2| \ll (\log(n)^{3+\epsilon} \tag{1.6}$$

Concerning these problems,A.I.Vinogradov[23],Gallagher[24],K'atai [25],Montgomery and Vaughan [26],Wang Yuan [27],Prachar [28],Pan Cheng Dong [29],Lu Ming Gao [30], and Wang Yuan and Shan Zun [31] have made some

valuable contributions, for example, K'atai proved that the right hand side of the above formula can be replaced by $(\log(n))^2$

B)The Sieve method: the historical origin of sieve method may be traced back to the "sieve of Eratosthenes" in 250 B.C. *Eratosthenes noted that the prime numbers between* $\sqrt{n}$ *and* n *can be isolated by multiple of a prime not exceeding* $\sqrt{n}$*. This method has a large error term compared with* n*.*

Dimitrii Ziniviev [32]in 1997 showed that under the assumption of the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis every odd integer greater than 10^{20} can be written as a sum of three primes.R. Balasubramanian and C.J.Mozzochi showed [33] in 1983 that under the Generalized RH one could establish the Goldbach's conjecture by the circle method provided and could obtain a certain estimate for the integral of representation function over the minor arcs. Then, they proved that RH can be weakened to the assumption that Siegel's zeros do not exist. The case when Siegel's zeros do exist is then considered. S. Srinivasan [34] showed that the conjectured asymptotic formulae for Goldbach's problem and the allied twin-primes conjecture are available conditionally.

An investigation of all methods cited and the other methods, it seems impossible to solve the conjecture 1) by some modifications of the present methods. Hence there are many who believe that Hardy's address that conjecture 1)is *"probably as difficult as any of the unsolved problems in mathematics"* is still valid now as it was then. Therefore a new idea is completely needed in a further study on Goldbach's Conjecture 1).In any case, we give a new idea for solving this problem where is different from that of the last given methods by the other authors. This new idea by a conjecture presented in Lemma

4.9 is applicable for the natural even numbers $n \geq 120$.On the other hand, it is not forced that n be an un-known large integer.On the other side,in this paper is assumed to be true Riemann Hypothesis.

2. INTRODUCTION TO THE ELEMENTARY THEORIES

By introducing to the basic theory in this section, the way is paved for the development and application of the rather advanced number theory of the Goldbach's Conjecture in the subsequent sections. Here, the first and for that matter in the remainder of the paper, we have tried to make clear the structure of our method based upon the elementary number theory, but much importantly to understand. In the next sections, we begin toward the higher theories such as: Riemann Zeta Function and its zeros, An explicit formula for $\pi(x)$, Hilbert's Zeros Theorem, N-dimensional Affine Spaces and Multivariate Congruences. In the following Lemmas, symbol $\vee$ is instead of logic "or" and symbol $\wedge$ instead of logic "and".

Lemma 2.1

Let n be an integer and greater than or equal to 8(for $n < 8$ is clear that $6 = 3 + 3 \wedge 4 = 2 + 2$) and determine reduced residue system congruent modulo n so:

$$S = \{r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k\} \tag{2.1}$$

Define:

$$\{A = S^2|_{sorted} = (r_i, r_j)|r_i, r_j \in S, i < j\} \tag{2.2}$$

Then, there is a subset as B:

$$B \subset A = \{(r_i, r_j) \in A | r_i + r_j = n\} \tag{2.3}$$

Proof:

$\forall r_i \in S \Rightarrow gcd(n, r_i) = 1$,assume $n - r_i = r_j$,it should be proved that $r_j \in S$. A contradiction arises as follows:
$r_j \ni S \Rightarrow gcd(r_j, n) = d \Rightarrow d \mid n, d \mid r_j, then, d \mid n - r_j \wedge d \mid n \Rightarrow d \mid r_i \Rightarrow d \mid gcd(n, r_i) = 1 \Rightarrow d = 1 \Rightarrow r_j \in S$Thus, there are ordered pairs in the form $(r_i, r_j) \in B$.

Lemma 2.2

Let $n \geq 8$, then there are at least two prime numbers in every reduced residue system congruent modulo n.

Proof:

Note: Although this Lemma is correct for all the integers, but we consider it only for even numbers,n. Consider, the other subset so that

$$C \subset B, C = \{(r_i, r_j) | (r_i, r_j) \in B \wedge r_i \; is \; prime\} \tag{2.4}$$

then we should prove that there is at least a member in the subset C. Contradiction: suppose C hasn't any member or it has only one member. Let $\acute{S} \subset S$ so that every member of $\acute{S}$ is not prime, but it is a product of relatively primes to n and the sum of each pair of its members is also n. Therefore,

let r_i and r_j be two members of $\acute{S}$. If $r_i \neq r_j, r_i = P_1^{\alpha_1} P_2^{\alpha_2} \dots P_k^{\alpha_k}, r_j = P_1^{\acute{\alpha}_1} P_2^{\acute{\alpha}_2} \dots P_k^{\acute{\alpha}_k}, (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \acute{\alpha}_1, \dots, \acute{\alpha}_k \geq 0), gcd(r_i, n) = gcd(r_j, n) = 1, r_i + r_j = n, \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_i \leq \alpha_k, \acute{\alpha}_1 \leq \acute{\alpha}_i \leq \acute{\alpha}_k$, then all P_1 to P_k are relatively primes to n. Let $gcd(r_i, r_j) = d$ and $r_i + r_j = n \Rightarrow d \mid n$ *then* $d \mid gcd(r_i, n) \vee d \mid gcd(r_j, n) \Rightarrow d \mid 1$ *thus* $gcd(r_i, r_j) = 1$. Also, $gcd(r_i, r_j) = gcd(P_1^{\alpha_1} P_2^{\alpha_2} \dots P_k^{\alpha_k}, P_1^{\acute{\alpha}_1} P_2^{\acute{\alpha}_2} \dots P_k^{\acute{\alpha}_k}) = P_1^{\min(\alpha_1, \acute{\alpha}_1)} P_2^{\min(\alpha_2, \acute{\alpha}_2)} \dots P_k^{\min(\alpha_k, \acute{\alpha}_k)} = 1 \Rightarrow$

$\min(\alpha_1, \acute{\alpha}_1) = 0, \dots, \min(\alpha_k, \acute{\alpha}_k) = 0 \Rightarrow \alpha_1 = 0 \vee \acute{\alpha}_1 = 0, \dots, \alpha_k = 0 \vee \acute{\alpha}_k = 0$. Hence,there isn't any common prime factor to r_i and r_j,then one can consider $r_i = P_i^{\alpha_i}$, $r_j = P_j^{\alpha_j}$ due to inequality $r_i \neq r_j$. The inequality $P_i \neq P_j$ must be satisfied i.e. there is at least two primes P_i and P_j in the subset $\acute{S}$ that are both distinct and relatively primes. Therefore it is concluded that there is at least a member in the subset C and at least two primes in the ordered pairs of it. If there is only one ordered pair in the subset C, then any one of two members of ordered pair will be prime and the problem is proved, but if there is two or more ordered pairs, then their second member may not be prime. At the following of the paper, we prove that there is at least one ordered pair in the subset C so that its second member i.e. r_j is also the prime. Obviously, the Goldbach's Conjecture would be proved.

Lemma 2.3

Consider sets D_1 *to* D_k *so:*$D_1 = \{r_1^1, \dots, r_{m_1}^1\}, \dots, D_k = \{r_1^k, \dots, r_{m_k}^k\}$ *where* $r_1^1 < \dots < r_{m_1}^1$ *and* $r_1^k < \dots < r_{m_k}^k$. *The members of* D_1 *to* D_k *denote relatively primes from* n *to* $N = n - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k-1} (r_1^j)^2 + f(k)$ *respectively. Then*

based on the previous Lemma, there are sets D_1 to D_k. The members of D_1 denote the first members of the ordered pairs of the subset C (here r_1^1 and $r_{m_1}^1$ denote the first and last relatively primes to n respectively, r_1^k and $r_{m_k}^k$ denote the first and last relatively primes to N respectively. Subscripts denote the number of the relatively primes and superscripts represent the number of the intervals).Let $P_{r_1^1}$ to $P_{r_1^k}$ be primes,then there are such primes at one of the following intervals:

$$n-(r_1^1)^2+1 < P_{r_1^1} < n \vee n-(r_1^1)^2+1-(r_1^2)^2+1 < P_{r_1^2} < n-(r_1^1)^2+1\ , \ldots , \vee \tag{2.5}$$

$$n-(r_1^1)^2+1-(r_1^2)^2+1-(r_1^3)^2+1-\ldots-(r_1^k)^2+1 < P_{r_1^k} < n-(r_1^1)^2+1-(r_1^2)^2+1-(r_1^3)^2+1-\ldots-(r_1^{k-1})^2+1$$

If assume $f(k)=k-1$ and r_1^0 then can be written generally:

$$n-\sum_{j=1}^{j=k}(r_1^j)^2+f(k+1) < P_{r_1^k} < n-\sum_{j=0}^{j=k-1}(r_1^j)^2+f(k) \tag{2.6}$$

$k \in \mathbb{N}$(*set of the natural numbers*)$n \in 2\mathbb{N}-\{2,4,6\}$.

Proof:

If

$$n-(r_1^1)^2+1 < P_{r_1^1} < n \Rightarrow n-P_{r_1^1} < (r_1^1)^2-1 \wedge gcd(P_{r_1^1},n)=1 \wedge gcd(n-P_{r_1^1},n)=1 \Rightarrow \tag{2.7}$$

$P_{r_1^1} \in D_1$

Let $x = n - P_{r_1^1}$ just we should prove that x is a prime. Contradiction: suppose x is not a prime, then it should be one of the two values $x = r_1^1 r_2^1 \vee (r_1^1)^2$ and based on the inequality (2.7) $r_1^1 r_2^1 \vee (r_1^1)^2 < (r_1^1)^2 - 1$, therefore $r_2^1 < r_1^1 \vee r_1^1 < r_1^1$ (both r_1^1 and r_2^1 are primes and greater than or equal 3). One will be able to see that non-of the inequalities may be established. Inequality $r_2^1 < r_1^1$ contradicts the well-ordering principle. Hence,$x \neq r_1^1 r_2^1 \vee (r_1^1)^2$ and the result is so that x may not be produced by the members of set D_1 therefore x is a prime. On the other hand $n - P_{r_1^1} = \acute{P} \Rightarrow n = P_{r_1^1} + \acute{P}$ Generally, using the inequality (2.6) could be written:

$$n - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k-1} (r_1^j)^2 + f(k) - (r_1^k)^2 - f(k) + f(k+1) < P_{r_1^k} < n - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k-1} (r_1^j)^2 + f(k) \tag{2.8}$$

Let $N = n - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k-1} (r_1^j)^2 + f(k)$. It is clear that N is even.The inequality (2.8) could be written as below:

$$N - \{(r_1^k)^2 + f(k) - f(k+1)\} < P_{r_1^k} < N, \quad N - P_{r_1^k} < (r_1^k)^2 + f(k) - f(k+1) \tag{2.9}$$

Take $x = N - P_{r_1^k}$ then:

$$x = r_1^k r_2^k \vee (r_1^k)^2 \Rightarrow r_1^k r_2^k \vee (r_1^k)^2 < (r_1^k)^2 + f(k) - f(k+1) \Rightarrow r_1^k r_2^k \vee (r_1^k)^2 < (r_1^k)^2 - 1 < (r_1^k)^2 \tag{2.10}$$

Because $f(k) - f(k+1) = -1$ then,$r_1^k r_2^k \vee (r_1^k)^2 < (r_1^k)^2$ where is contradiction. Therefore,$N - P_{r_1^k}$ may not be produced by the members of D_k hence $N - P_{r_1^k}$ is prime and $N - P_{r_1^k} = \acute{P_k} \Rightarrow N = P_{r_1^k} + \acute{P_k}$.All the D_1 to D_k denote the reduced residue systems congruent modules from n to $N = n - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k-1} (r_1^j)^2 + f(k)$ respectively and all their members are primes. Hence if there is one of the above primes in its related interval then subtrac-

tion from the related super mum of the interval (N)will be a prime.

Lemma 2.4

There is an even number as N for each even number as n where $N = n - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k-1}(r_1^j)^2 + f(k)$ and N is a function. There is not also a Homomorphism from n to N.

Proof:

N is a function because if we find a prime as P in one of the intervals given in the Lemma 2.3, then we will not continue to find another typical P thus, there is only an even as N for each even as n and $N = h(n)$:

$$h(n) = n - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k-1}(r_1^j)^2 + f(k) \tag{2.11}$$

$$h(n) : 2\mathbb{N} - \{2, 4, 6\} \longrightarrow 2\mathbb{N} - \{2\}$$

Function $h : n \longrightarrow h(n)$ is not a Homomorphism, because if one considers the two even numbers as n and m then:

$$h(nm) = nm - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k_{nm}-1}(r_1^j)_{nm}^2 + f_{nm}(k) \tag{2.12}$$

$$h(n)h(m) = (n - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k_n-1}(r_1^j)_n^2 + f_n(k))(m - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k_m-1}(r_1^j)_m^2 + f_m(k)) \neq nm - \sum_{j=0}^{j=k_{nm}-1}(r_1^j)_{nm}^2 + f_{nm}(k) \tag{2.13}$$

3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEORIES

In this section, the new method which discussed in the previous chapter, is developed, the new generated function is also extended and its being surjective is proved by two methods. These developments are given in the Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2.

In the Lemma 3.2, the methods of solving the multivariate congruences using the Chinese remainder theorem and n-dimensional affine spaces are given. At the end of the section, one will be ready for essential study about the Goldbach's Conjecture by $\Pi(x)$,$\pi(x)$ and the Riemann Zeta Function. Using the Riemann Zeta Function and the results of the sections 2 and 3, the Sabihi's functions $sum(n)$,$M(n.m)$ and, $K(n,m)$ will be introduced in the next section.

Lemma 3.1

Let define an extended function of $h(n)$ *onto* $2\mathbb{N}-\{2,4,6\} \longrightarrow 2\mathbb{N}-\{2\}$, *then this function can be constructed with the following properties:*

$$\hat{h}(n) = n - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\prod_{i=1}^{i=m}(r_i^j)^{x_i} + f(k) \quad ,\prod_{i=1}^{m} r_i^0 = 0 \tag{3.1}$$

$$\hat{h}(n) : 2\mathbb{N}-\{2,4,6\} \longrightarrow 2\mathbb{N}-\{2\}$$

where $x_i's$ *belong to the set of the natural numbers plus zero.*$r_i^{j'}s$ *denote primes which are relatively primes to* $N(k) = n - \sum_{j=0}^{k-2}\prod_{i=1}^{i=m}(r_i^j)^{x_i} + f(k) - 1$. $f(k) = k-1$ *and* $r_1^j < r_2^j < \ldots < r_m^j.j$ *denotes the number of steps and* i *denotes the number of prime factors which are relatively prime to* $N(k)$ *in*

j-th step.$N(k)$ denotes even which is obtained by k-th interval.

Proof:

Let P be a prime and $gcd(N(k)-P,n) = gcd(N(k),P) = 1$ let $(r_1^j)^{x_1} \dots (r_m^j)^{x_m}$ be the greatest product of the prime factors which are less than $N(k)$ then $(r_1^j)^{x_1-1} \dots (r_m^j)^{x_m}$ should be the greatest product of the prime factors immediately before it and the following inequalities could be written:

$$N(k) - (r_1^j)^{x_1} \dots (r_m^j)^{x_m} + 1 < P < N(k) - (r_1^j)^{x_1-1} \dots (r_m^j)^{x_m} - 1 \qquad (3.2)$$

$$(r_1^j)^{x_1-1} \dots (r_m^j)^{x_m} < (r_1^j)^{x_1-1} \dots (r_m^j)^{x_m} + 1 < N(k) - P < (r_1^j)^{x_1} \dots (r_m^j)^{x_m} - 1 < (r_1^j)^{x_1} \dots (r_m^j)^{x_m} \Rightarrow (r_1^j)^{x_1-1} \dots (r_m^j)^{x_m} < N(k) - P < (r_1^j)^{x_1} \dots (r_m^j)^{x_m}$$

Therefore,if there is a P in the first above interval, then $N(k) - P$ will be certainly a prime, because $N(k) - P$ could not be product of any of prime factors r_1^j to r_m^j.At first $\hat{h}(n)$ considers all the products of the prime factors less than $N(k)$. If P there is not in the intervals developed by $N(k)$, then it considers $N(k) - \prod_i^m (r_i^{k-1})^{x_i} + 1$ instead of $N(k)$ and makes all the products of the prime factors less than $N(k) - \prod_i^m (r_i^{k-1})^{x_i} + 1$ until a P is found. If there is not again a P then it will continue this operation until a P is finally found.In the same Lemma, if we only make all the products of the prime factors less than n,we will certainly find a P in the intervals developed by n and it is not necessary to continue operation. See the following example:

Example1:

Let $n = 26$. Strictly increasing products of the prime factors less than 26 are:$3^2, 3 \times 5, 3 \times 7, 5^2$. Let P_1 to P_4 be primes in the desirable intervals developed by 26 and r_1 to r_4 be primes in the other intervals of the length 2.

$26-3^2+1 < P_1 < 26$ $\qquad lenght\ of\ interval = 8$

$26-3^2-1 < r_1 < 26-3^2+1$ $\qquad lenght\ of\ interval = 2$

$26-3\times5+1 < P_2 < 26-3^2-1$ $\qquad lenght\ of\ interval = 4$

$26-3\times5-1 < r_2 < 26-3\times5+1$ $\qquad lenght\ of\ interval = 2$

$26-3\times7+1 < P_3 < 26-3\times5-1$ $\qquad lenght\ of\ interval = 4$

$26-3\times7-1 < r_3 < 26-3\times7+1$ $\qquad lenght\ of\ interval = 2$

$26-5^2+1 < P_4 < 26-3\times7-1$ $\qquad lenght\ of\ interval = 2$

$26-5^2-1 < r_4 < 26-5^2+1$ $\qquad lenght\ of\ interval = 2$

Based on the Lemma 3.1 if there is a prime number as P in the desirable intervals so $gcd(P, n) = 1$ and $n - P > 1$, then $n - P$ will be certainly a prime.

Lemma 3.2

Consider the function $\hat{h}(n)$ defined bythe relation (3.3) onto $2\mathbb{N}-\{2\}$, then this function is a surjective one.

$$\hat{h}(n)=n-\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\prod_{i=1}^{i=m}(r_i^j)^{x_i}+f(k) \tag{3.3}$$

Proof: The first method

If we find a n for a typical $\hat{h}(n)$ based on the relation (3.1),then we can prove the Lemma. Let:

$$\hat{h}(n)+\prod_{i=1}^{m}(r_i^1)^{x_i}-1=n \tag{3.4}$$

In this relation $k=2\wedge f(2)=1$ and using this relation, we must find an unknown n by a known $\hat{h}(n)$.Let r_1^1 to r_m^1 be the recognized primes of ordered based on the well-ordering principle. They are some members of reduced residue system set congruent module n and also let P_1^1 to $P_{\acute{m}}^1$ be known primes so that P_1^1 to $P_{\acute{m}}^1\mid n$ and $P_1^1<\ldots<P_{\acute{m}}^1<r_1^1$ then we have:

$$n=2kP_1^1\ldots P_{\acute{m}}^1 \tag{3.5}$$

Based on the relation (3.4),could be written:

$$\prod_{i=1}^{m}(r_i^1)^{x_i}\equiv 1-\hat{h}(n)\ mod(2\prod_{j=1}^{\acute{m}}(P_j^1)) \tag{3.6}$$

Solutions of the relation (3.6)should also be simultaneously satisfied by the relation (3.4).Just,the problem is: solving the congruence (3.6).In order to obtain the solution, we use the Chinese remainder theorem (for the proof of this theorem, see [35]). From the relation (3.6) could be written:

$$(r_1^1)^{x_1} \dots (r_m^1)^{x_m} \equiv 1 - \hat{h}(n) \ mod(2 \prod_{j=1}^{\acute{m}} (P_j^1)) \tag{3.7}$$

Let

$$J = 2 \prod_{j=1}^{\acute{m}} (P_j^1)$$

Then,the relation(3.7)can be decomposed into the relations (3.8) and (3.9).

$$(r_1^1)^{x_1} \equiv 1 \ mod(J), \dots, (r_{m-1}^1)^{x_{m-1}} \equiv 1 \ mod(J) \tag{3.8}$$

$$(r_m^1)^{x_m} \equiv 1 - \hat{h}(n) \ mod(J) \tag{3.9}$$

Obviously, from the product of the above congruences in the relations (3.8) and (3.9) together, the relation (3.7) will be constructed. Let L_m be the least common multiple of the following functions(ϕ is Euler's function):

$$\phi(2), \phi(P_1^1), \dots, \phi(P_{\acute{m}}^1) \tag{3.10}$$

Substituting L_m in any one of variables x_1 to x_{m-1} one sees that L_m can be an optional solution for (3.8), because $\phi(J)$ is a solution for (3.8) and

$$gcd(r_1^1, J) = \dots = gcd(r_{m-1}^1, J) = 1 \tag{3.11}$$

Then $L_m \mid \phi(J)$ thus L_m is the smallest solution for the relation (3.8). For solving (3.9),we decompose it into the following congruences:

$$(r_m^1)^{x_{m_0}} \equiv 1 - \hat{h}(n) \ mod(2), \dots, (r_m^1)^{x_{m_{\acute{m}}}} \equiv 1 - \hat{h}(n) \ mod(P_{\acute{m}}^1) \tag{3.12}$$

In the relation (3.12) the primes 2 to $P^1_{\acute{m}}$ and r^1_m must be determined so that can be relatively prime to $1-\hat{h}(n)$.We determine primitive roots for 2 to $P^1_{\acute{m}}$ and r^1_m then:

$$1-\hat{h}(n) \equiv (g_i)^{C_i}\ mod(P^1_i), \qquad i = 1\ to\ \acute{m} \tag{3.13}$$

$$1-\hat{h}(n) \equiv (g_0)^{C_0}\ mod(2), \qquad i = 0, \quad P^1_0 = 2 \tag{3.14}$$

$$r^1_m \equiv (g_0)^{a_0}\ mod(2), \ldots, r^1_m \equiv (g_i)^{a_i}\ mod(P^1_i), \qquad i = 1\ to\ \acute{m} \tag{3.15}$$

$$(r^1_m)^{x_{m_0}} \equiv (g_0)^{a_0 x_{m_0}} \equiv (g_0)^{C_0} \equiv 1-\hat{h}(n)\ mod(2) \tag{3.16}$$

$$(r^1_m)^{x_{m_i}} \equiv (g_i)^{a_i x_{m_i}} \equiv (g_i)^{C_i} \equiv 1-\hat{h}(n)\ mod(P^1_i), \qquad i = 1\ to\ \acute{m}$$

$$(g_0)^{a_0 x_{m_0}} \equiv (g_0)^{C_0}\ mod(2) \Rightarrow a_0 x_{m_0} \equiv C_0\ mod(1) \tag{3.17}$$

$$(g_i)^{a_i x_{m_i}} \equiv (g_i)^{C_i}\ mod(P^1_i) \Rightarrow a_i x_{m_i} \equiv C_i\ mod(P^1_i - 1) \tag{3.18}$$

$$gcd(a_i, (P^1_i - 1)) = d_i \tag{3.19}$$

$$\frac{a_i x_{m_i}}{d_i} \equiv \frac{C_i}{d_i}\ mod(\frac{(P^1_i - 1)}{d_i}) \tag{3.20}$$

Condition of having the solution:

$$gcd(\frac{a_i}{d_i}, \frac{(P^1_i - 1)}{d_i}) \mid \frac{C_i}{d_i} \tag{3.21}$$

Then:

$$x_{m_i} \equiv (\frac{C_i}{d_i})(\frac{a_i}{d_i})^{-1}\ mod(\frac{(P^1_i - 1)}{d_i}) \tag{3.22}$$

$$x_{m_j} \equiv (\frac{C_j}{d_j})(\frac{a_j}{d_j})^{-1} \ mod(\frac{(P_j^1-1)}{d_j})$$

Let:

$$gcd(\frac{(P_i^1-1)}{d_i}, \frac{(P_j^1-1)}{d_j}) = d_{ij}, \qquad i \neq j, \quad i,j = o \ \ to \ \ \acute{m} \tag{3.23}$$

If

$$(\frac{C_i}{d_i})(\frac{a_i}{d_i})^{-1} \equiv (\frac{C_j}{d_j})(\frac{a_j}{d_j})^{-1} mod(d_{ij}) \tag{3.24}$$

establishes for $i \neq j$ and $i,j = 0 \ \ to \ \ \acute{m}$ then the congruences (3.22) will have the simultaneous solutions.

Let:

$$\frac{(P_i^1-1)}{d_i} = \prod_{l=1}^{L} (\acute{P}_{li}^1)^{\alpha_{li}}, \qquad i = 0 \ \ to \ \ \acute{m} \tag{3.25}$$

Based on the Chinese remainder theorem, the following congruences will always have simultaneous solutions:

$$x_{m_i} \equiv (\frac{C_i}{d_i})(\frac{a_i}{d_i})^{-1} \ mod((\acute{P}_{li}^1)^{\alpha_{li}}), \qquad i = 0 \ \ to \ \ \acute{m} \tag{3.26}$$

$$\vdots \ \ \vdots \ \ \vdots \ \ \vdots \ \ \vdots \ \ \vdots \ \ \vdots$$

$$x_{m_i} \equiv (\tfrac{C_i}{d_i})(\tfrac{a_i}{d_i})^{-1} \ mod((\acute{P}_{Li}^1)^{\alpha_{Li}}), \qquad i = 0 \ \ to \ \ \acute{m}$$

Let x_m be a solution for the relations (3.26) and:

$$\frac{(P_i^1-1)}{d_i} = m_i, \qquad i = 0 \ \ to \ \ \acute{m} \tag{3.27}$$

Let M be the Least common multiple of $m_1, \ldots, m_{\acute{m}}$

$$M = \prod_{k=1}^{t} q_k^{\gamma_k}, \qquad gcd(q_1, \ldots, q_t) = 1 \tag{3.28}$$

Also assume

$$q_k^{\gamma_k} = I_i, \qquad i = 1 \ \ to \ \ t \tag{3.29}$$

Suppose we have solutions as:

$$x_i \equiv d_i \ mod(I_i) \qquad i = 1 \ \ to \ \ t \tag{3.30}$$

and $d_i s$ have been known for $i = 1 \ \ to \ \ t$ then:

$$x_m = \sum_{i=1}^{t} y_i d_i \tag{3.31}$$

Therefore could be written:

$$y_i \equiv 1 \ mod(I_1) \tag{3.32}$$

$$y_i \equiv 0 \ mod(I_i), \qquad i = 2 \ \ to \ \ t$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots$$

$$y_t \equiv 1 \ mod(I_t)$$

$$y_t \equiv 0 \ mod(I_i), \qquad i = 1 \ \ to \ \ (t-1)$$

$$\acute{I}_i = \frac{I_1 \dots I_t}{I_i}, \qquad gcd(I_i, \acute{I}_i) = 1 \tag{3.33}$$

Hence there are m solutions in the natural number set for the relations (3.6) or (3.7).Just any one of m solutions should be checked by for the relation (3.4) because may not be established some solutions. Thus there is an even such as n for every even such as $\hat{h}(n)$ so that it satisfies the relation (3.4) and conditions of the function $\hat{h}(n)$.

Proof: The second method

Taking the Logarithm of the relation (3.6),a m-variate super plane is obtained:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i logr_i^1 = log(1 - \hat{h}(n) + 2k_1 \prod_{j=1}^{\acute{m}} P_j^1), \quad k_1 \in \mathbb{N} \tag{3.34}$$

We should prove that there is a subset $X \subset \mathbb{N}$ onto the relation (3.34) so:

$$X = X_1 \cup \ldots \cup X_m \tag{3.35}$$

X_1 to X_m denote subsets onto the following super planes:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i logr_i^1 = log(1 - \hat{h}(n) + \acute{k}_1 P_1^1), \quad \acute{k}_1 \in \mathbb{N} \tag{3.36}$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i logr_i^1 = log(1 - \hat{h}(n) + \acute{k}_{\acute{m}} P_{\acute{m}}^1), \quad \acute{k}_{\acute{m}} \in \mathbb{N} \tag{3.37}$$

Define:

$$P = (x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in A_k^m \tag{3.38}$$

$$A = k[X_1, \ldots, X_m] \tag{3.39}$$

$$V(f) = \{P \in A_k^m | f_1(P) = 0, \quad i = 1 \ \ to \ \ m\} \tag{3.40}$$

$$f = (f_1, \ldots, f_m) \in A \tag{3.41}$$

A_k^m denotes an m-dimensional affine space onto the field k and f denotes the base ideal of all polynomials. Thus,$V(f)$ denotes a super plane which is the geometric location of points which will be verified by the finite several polynomial equations, therefore we are able to use the Hilbert's zeros theorem, assuming k is a closed algebraic field. A maximal ideal of polynomial ring A for P is $m_P = (X_1 - x_1, \ldots, X_m - x_m)$ i.e. ideal of all the polynomials which are nullified in P, thus if polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ represent the relations (3.36) to (3.37) and none of them be multiple of each other, then they will show distinctive super-planes $V(f_1), \ldots, V(f_m)$, so if they have distinctive solutions based on the Chinese Remainder Theorem. This means that having simutaneous solutions X_1 to X_m, we have

$$X = n_1 X_1 + \ldots + n_m X_m \tag{3.42}$$

where implies the relation (3.34). Conversely, we should prove that the relation (3.34) could be stated as solutions (3.36) to (3.37) based on the Galois' Original Element theorem since k is an infinite field of polynomials. These solutions are to be natural and show super planes limited to $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ planes in the m-dimensional space so that the number of the natural solutions are also limited. Thus, if we define a finite extension and a distinctive field onto $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ as $L \subset k$ or in other word L onto k is generated by $X_1, \ldots, X_m$, hence $X \in k$ and

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^{m} n_i X_i \tag{3.43}$$

Finally concluded is that the equation (3.6) should have the natural solutions so that the function (3.1) will be surjective onto $2\mathbb{N} - \{2\}$.

4. APPROACHES TO A PROOF OF GOLDBACH'S CONJECTURE BY THE RIEMANN ZETA FUNCTION AND FUNCTIONS sum(N(k)),M(N(k),m) AND K(N(k),m)

In this section, we obtain the explicit formulas for the two important functions in mathematics. We then make use of them for the computation of the number of primes in a certain interval and define a special sum on $\pi(N(k))$ so called $sum(N(k))$. Using $sum(N(k))$, the function $K(N(k), m)$ is made. The function $K(N(k), m)$ is indeed a sum of the primes containing in an interval of the length $sum(N(k))$ between $N(k)$ and m times $N(k)$ ($mN(k)$ where m also denotes a natural number).Using this function, we able to show if there is at least one prime in one of the intervals created under $N(k)$, then its subtraction from $N(k)$ should also be a prime.On other word, the existence of a one to one function is also proved.

Lemma 4.1

Let

$$Li(x) = \frac{x}{log(x)} + \int_2^x \frac{du}{(log(u))^2} + O(1) \tag{4.1}$$

Then:

$$\Pi(x) = Li(x) - \sum_{\gamma>0}\{Li(x^\rho) + Li(x^{1-\rho})\} + \int_x^\infty \frac{du}{u(u^2-1)log(u)} - 3.7277log2 \tag{4.2}$$

Proof:

The proof is consisted of the two sections, the first for $x \neq P^n$ and the second for $x = P^n$ where P denotes a prime,n a natural number, $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$ a zero of the Riemann Zeta function, and $x \geq 2$.

4.1. The first section of the proof for $x \neq P^n$

Based on the definition of $\Pi(x)$ could be written:

$$\Pi(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{log(n)} \tag{4.3}$$

The following theorems are expressed and used for the proof of the Lemma 4.1.

Theorem 4.2

The Abel Summation Formula.(for the proof, see [36]).

Theorem 4.3

Let $\psi(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n)$,then $\Pi(x) = \frac{\psi(x)}{log(x)} + \int_2^x \frac{\psi(u)du}{ulog^2(u)}$ *(for the proof, see [36]).*

Theorem 4.4

1) *If* $\Re(s) > 0$ *and* $E(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq 1 \\ x-1 & \text{if } x > 1 \end{cases}$ *then we have* $\frac{1}{s(s+1)} =$

$\int_0^\infty \frac{E(x)}{x^{s+2}}$ 2)If $c > 0$ *is any fixed real number,then for all* $x > 0$ *we have* $E(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} \frac{x^{s+1}}{s(s+1)}ds$*(for the proof, see [36]).*

Using the above theorems,the contour C_n is defined by the following form (referring to the Fig.1).Let $n \geq 3$ and $N(T)$ be the number of the zeros of the type $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$ of the function $\xi(s)$ and $0 < \gamma < T$,$0 < \Re(s) < 1$ thus the zeros of the function $\xi(s)$ are equal to the zeros of the function $\zeta(s)$(Riemann Zeta Function)together with simple zeros at the points $s = -2r, r = 1, 2, \ldots,$.Let $\{T_n\}$ be an infinite series of the real numbers that $n < T_n < n + 1$ so $s = \sigma + iT_n$ and $-n \leq \sigma \leq 2$ then

$$I_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{C_n} \frac{Z(s)}{s(s+1)}x^{s+1}ds \tag{4.4}$$

$$I_n = J_n + k_n \tag{4.5}$$

J_n denotes integral along the line connected between $2 - iT_n$ to $2 + iT_n$.

k_n denotes integral along the other three sides of the rectangle.Just,we determine the poles of the function $\frac{Z(s)}{s(s+1)}$
At first,we obtain the function $Z(s)$ by the functions $\zeta(s)$ and $\xi(s)$

$$Z(s) = -\frac{\acute{\zeta}(s)}{\zeta(s)} \tag{4.6}$$

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{\xi(s)\pi^{\frac{s}{2}}}{(s-1)\Gamma(1+\frac{s}{2})} \tag{4.7}$$


-n+iT_n
t
2+iT_n
-2[n/2]
...
-4
-2
0
1
2
σ
-n-iT_n
2-iT_n

Fig1.Representation of the poles of the function $\frac{Z(s)}{s(s+1)}$

where $\Gamma(s)$ denotes the gamma function.

If $s = \sigma + it$ and $\sigma > 0$ then

$$\Gamma(s) = \int_0^\infty \exp(-u)u^{s-1}du \tag{4.8}$$

And for all values of s could be written:

$$\frac{1}{s\Gamma(s)} = \exp(\gamma s)\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{n})\exp(\frac{-s}{n}) \tag{4.9}$$

Where γ denotes the Euler's constant.

$$\Gamma(s+1) = s\Gamma(s) \tag{4.10}$$

$$\Gamma(1+\frac{s}{2}) = \frac{s}{2}\Gamma(\frac{s}{2}) \tag{4.11}$$

$$\Gamma(1+\frac{s}{2}) = \frac{\frac{s}{2}}{\frac{s}{2}\exp(\gamma\frac{s}{2})\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2n})\exp(\frac{-s}{2n})} = \frac{1}{\exp(\gamma\frac{s}{2})\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2n})\exp(\frac{-s}{2n})} \tag{4.12}$$

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{\pi^{\frac{s}{2}}\xi(s)\exp(\gamma\frac{s}{2})\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2n})\exp(\frac{-s}{2n})}{(s-1)} \tag{4.13}$$

$$\acute{\zeta}(s) =$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (s-1)\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{log\pi}{2}\pi^{\frac{s}{2}}\xi(s)\exp(\gamma\frac{s}{2})\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2n})\exp(\frac{-s}{2n})+ \\ \acute{\xi}(s)\pi^{\frac{s}{2}}\exp(\gamma\frac{s}{2})\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2n})\exp(\frac{-s}{2n})+ \\ \frac{\gamma}{2}\pi^{\frac{s}{2}}\xi(s)\exp(\gamma\frac{s}{2})\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2n})\exp(\frac{-s}{2n})+ \\ +\exp(\gamma\frac{s}{2})\pi^{\frac{s}{2}}\xi(s)\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{2}\exp(\frac{-s}{2})\prod_{n=2}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2n})\exp(\frac{-s}{2n})+ \\ \frac{1}{4}\exp(\frac{-s}{2})\prod_{n=1,3,4,5,\ldots}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2n})\exp(\frac{-s}{2n})+\ldots+ \\ \frac{1}{2n}\exp(\frac{-s}{2n})\prod_{j=1,\ldots,n-1}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2j})\exp(\frac{-s}{2j})- \\ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2j}\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2n})\exp(\frac{-s}{2n}) \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \\ -\exp(\gamma\frac{s}{2})\pi^{\frac{s}{2}}\xi(s)\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1+\frac{s}{2n})\exp(\frac{-s}{2n}) \end{array} \right\}$$

$$(s-1)^2 \qquad (4.14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z(s) &= -\lim_{n\longrightarrow\infty}[\frac{log\pi}{2}+\frac{\acute{\xi}(s)}{\xi(s)}+\frac{\gamma}{2}+\frac{1}{2(1+\frac{s}{2})}+\ldots+ \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2n(1+\frac{s}{2n})}-(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{4}+\ldots+\frac{1}{2n})-\frac{1}{(s-1)}] = \\ &= -[\frac{log\pi}{2}+\frac{\acute{\xi}(s)}{\xi(s)}+\frac{\gamma}{2}+\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(s+2j)} \end{aligned}$$

$$-\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2j}-\frac{1}{(s-1)}] \tag{4.15}$$

Let

$$\xi(s)=(s-\rho_1)(s-\rho_2)\dots(s-\rho_\gamma) \tag{4.16}$$

Then

$$Z(s)=-[\frac{log\pi}{2}+\frac{\gamma}{2}+\sum_{j=1}^{\gamma}\frac{1}{(s-\rho_j)}+\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(s+2j)}-\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2j}-\frac{1}{(s-1)}] \tag{4.17}$$

And the poles of $Z(s)$ are:

$$s=1,\rho_1,\dots,\rho_\gamma,-2r(r=1,2,\dots,\infty) \tag{4.18}$$

The poles of $\frac{Z(s)}{s(s+1)}$are:

$$s=0,1,-1,\rho_1,\dots,\rho_\gamma,-2r(r=1,2,\dots,\infty) \tag{4.19}$$

Because $\rho=\beta+\gamma i$ therefore, we consider the poles $\rho_1,\dots,\rho_\gamma$ so that $|\gamma|<T_n$ and $2r<n$. Cauchy's residue theorem now allows us to conclude

$$I_n=Z(0)x+\frac{x^2}{2}-Z(-1)-\sum_{2r<n}\frac{x^{1-2r}}{(2r)(1-2r)}-\sum_{|\gamma|<T_n}\frac{x^{\rho+1}}{\rho(\rho+1)}+k_n \qquad [36,37] \tag{4.20}$$

At the relation (4.20),one should show that for $x>1\wedge n\longrightarrow\infty$ the value $k_n\longrightarrow\infty$. In the last sum, if any of the zeros ρ are multiple, then the corresponding term occurs with the multiplicity of ρ.In this paper, we forbear from these types of terms due to Riemann hypothesis.

Theorem 4.5

Let $R(\delta) = \{s|\Re(s) \leq -\delta, |s+2r| \geq \delta, r = 1,2,\ldots\}$ *and* $s \in R(\delta)$, *then* $Z(s) < A_2(\delta)(log|s|+1)$ *where* $A_2(\delta)$ *is an explicitly computable function of* δ *(For the proof, refer to [36])*

Using the above theorem and that $n < T_n < n+1 \wedge T \longrightarrow \infty$, $s = \sigma + iT_n, -1 \leq \sigma \leq 2$ is resulted that $Z(s_n) = O\{log^2 n\}$ then,by $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}|Z(s)| < A_1 log^2 n, |s| \geq n, |s+1| \geq n \Rightarrow |x^{s+1}| \leq x^3$ could be written:

$$|k_n| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\int \frac{|Z(s)|}{|s(s+1)|}|x^{s+1}||ds| = O\{\frac{log^2 n}{n^2}(2n+4+2T_n)x^3\} \qquad (4.21)$$

Thus for $x > 1 \wedge n \longrightarrow \infty$, k_n will be near to zero, and the proof is completed.

Theorem 4.6

Let T *tends to infinity, then* $N(T+1) - N(T) = O(logT), \sum_{0<\gamma\leq T}\frac{1}{\gamma} = O(log^2 T)$ *and* $\sum_{\gamma>T}\frac{1}{\gamma^2} = O(\frac{logT}{T})$ *in particular, the series* $\sum \gamma^{-2}$ *is convergent.(For proof, refer to [36])*

Two series $\sum_{r=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^{1-2r}}{2r(2r-1)}$ and $\sum_{\rho}\frac{x^{1+\rho}}{\rho(1+\rho)}$ on any fixed interval $[1,X]$,the absolute values of the general terms are less than r^{-2} and $X^2|\gamma|^{-2}$ respectively. Hence both series are absolutely, uniformly convergent by appeal to the theorem 4.6. The uniform convergence of the series $\sum_{\rho}\frac{x^{1+\rho}}{\rho(1+\rho)}$ and the continuity

of $\acute{g}$ (g is any function with a continuous derivative on the interval $[a,b]$)on the interval $[a,b]$ is obvious,therefore we know because:

$$\psi_1(x) = \lim_{n\longrightarrow\infty}\left\{Z(0)x + \frac{x^2}{2} - Z(-1) - \sum_{2r<n}\frac{x^{1-2r}}{(2r)(1-2r)} - \sum_{|\gamma|<T_n}\frac{x^{\rho+1}}{\rho(\rho+1)}\right\} \quad [36,37] \tag{4.22}$$

the series function

$$\sum_{\rho}\int_a^b \acute{g}(x)\frac{x^{\rho+1}}{\rho(\rho+1)}dx \tag{4.23}$$

where $\acute{g}(x)$ denotes derivation of the function $g(x)$,is convergent.
Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} -\sum_{\rho}\int_a^b \acute{g}(x)\frac{x^{\rho+1}}{\rho(\rho+1)}dx &= \int_a^b \acute{g}(x)\{\psi_1(x) - \frac{x^2}{2} - Z(0)x + Z(-1) + \\ \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^{1-2r}}{(2r)(1-2r)}\}dx &= \int_a^b \acute{g}(x)f_1(x)dx \end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

where

$$f_1(x) = \psi_1(x) - \frac{x^2}{2} - Z(0)x + Z(-1) + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^{1-2r}}{(2r)(1-2r)} \tag{4.25}$$

and for $x \neq P^n$ we have:

$$f(x) = \acute{f}_1(x) \tag{4.26}$$

Because $\psi(x)$ is discontinuous at $x = P^n$ Then

$$\psi_0(x) = \frac{1}{2}\{\psi(x+0) + \psi(x-0)\} \tag{4.27}$$

If $x \neq P^n$

$$\psi_0(x) = \psi(x) \tag{4.28}$$

If $x = P^n$

$$\psi_0(x) = \psi(x) - \frac{1}{2}\Lambda(x) \tag{4.29}$$

If $x > 1$

$$\psi_0(x) = x + Z(0) - \frac{1}{2}log(1 - x^{-2}) - \lim_{T \longrightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\gamma|<T} \frac{x^\rho}{\rho} \tag{4.30}$$

For $x \neq P^n$ and substituting the relation (4.30) into the relation (4.31):

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(x) &= \frac{\psi(x)}{log(x)} + \int_2^x \frac{\psi(u)}{u(log(u))^2} du = \frac{x + Z(0) - \frac{1}{2}log(1-x^{-2}) - \lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{|\gamma|<T}\frac{x^\rho}{\rho}}{log(x)} \\ &+ \int_2^x \{\frac{u + Z(0) - \frac{1}{2}log(1-u^{-2}) - \lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{|\gamma|<T}\frac{u^\rho}{\rho}}{u(log(u))^2}\} du = \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \tfrac{x}{log(x)} + \tfrac{Z(0)}{log(x)} - \tfrac{log(1-x^{-2})}{2log(x)} - \lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{|\gamma|<T}\tfrac{\frac{x^\rho}{\rho}}{log(x)} + \int_2^x \tfrac{du}{log^2(u)} + \\ &Z(0)\int_2^x \tfrac{du}{ulog^2(u)} - \tfrac{1}{2}\int_2^x \tfrac{log(1-u^{-2})}{ulog^2(u)} du - \lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{|\gamma|<T}\int_2^x \tfrac{u^\rho du}{\rho u log^2(u)} \end{aligned}$$

because of

$$\int_2^x \frac{du}{ulog^2(u)} = \frac{1}{log2} - \frac{1}{log(x)} \tag{4.32}$$

$$Li(x) = \frac{x}{log(x)} + \int_2^x \frac{du}{log^2(u)} + O(1) \tag{4.33}$$

$$\frac{log(1-x^{-2})}{2log(x)}+\frac{1}{2}\int_2^x \frac{log(1-u^{-2})}{ulog^2(u)}du = \frac{log(1-x^{-2})}{2log(x)}+\frac{1}{2}\int_2^x log(1-u^{-2})d(\frac{-1}{log(u)}) \tag{4.34}$$

By integration by parts the relation (4.34) will be:

$$\frac{log(1-x^{-2})}{2log(x)}+\frac{1}{2}[\frac{-log(1-u^{-2})}{logu}]_2^x-\frac{1}{2}\int_2^x \frac{-2du}{ulogu(u^2-1)} = \frac{log(1-2^{-2})}{2log2}+\int_2^x \frac{du}{ulogu(u^2-1)} \tag{4.35}$$

Therefore, the relation (4.31) could be written:

$$\{\frac{x}{logx}+\int_2^x \frac{du}{log^2u}\}+\{\frac{Z(0)}{logx}+Z(0)\int_2^x \frac{du}{ulog^2u}\}-\{\frac{log(1-x^{-2})}{2log(x)}+\frac{1}{2}\int_2^x \frac{log(1-u^{-2})}{ulog^2(u)}du\}-\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{|\gamma|<T}\{\frac{x^\rho}{\rho logx}+\int_2^x \frac{u^\rho du}{\rho ulog^2u}\} \tag{4.36}$$

Also we have from the relation (4.36):

$$\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{|\gamma|<T}\{\frac{x^\rho}{\rho logx}+\int_2^x \frac{u^\rho du}{\rho ulog^2u}\} = \lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{\frac{x^\rho}{\rho logx}+\int_2^x \frac{u^\rho du}{\rho ulog^2u}\}+\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{-T<\gamma<0}\{\frac{x^\rho}{\rho logx}+\int_2^x \frac{u^\rho du}{\rho ulog^2u}\} \tag{4.37}$$

Because $\xi(s)$ is symmetric about the two lines $\Re(s)=\frac{1}{2}$ and $\Im(s)=0$ hence:

$$\rho=\beta+i\gamma,\quad \xi(\beta-i\gamma)=\xi(1-\beta+i\gamma),\quad \xi(\beta+i\gamma)=\xi(1-\beta-i\gamma) \tag{4.38}$$

Therefore: The first term of the right-hand side of the relation (4.37) by making the substitution $u^\rho=w$ in the integral will be:

$$\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{\frac{x^\rho}{\rho logx}+\int_2^x \frac{u^\rho du}{\rho ulog^2u}\}=\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{\frac{x^\rho}{\rho logx}+\frac{1}{\rho}\int_{2^\rho}^{x^\rho}\frac{u^{\rho-1}dw}{\rho u^{\rho-1}(\frac{1}{\rho})^2log^2w}\}$$

$$= \lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{\frac{x^\rho}{\rho logx}+\int_{2^\rho}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}+\int_{2}^{x^\rho}\frac{dw}{log^2w}\}=\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{Li(x^\rho)+$$
$$\int_{2^\rho}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}-O(1)\} \tag{4.39}$$

The second term of the right-hand side of the relation (4.37) is similar to the first term supposing $\beta=\frac{1}{2}$(This assumption is not necessary in general case):

$$\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{-T<\gamma<0}\{\frac{x^\rho}{\rho logx}+\int_{2}^{x}\frac{u^\rho du}{\rho u log^2u}\}=\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{Li(x^{1-\rho})+\int_{2^{1-\rho}}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}-O(1)\} \tag{4.40}$$

Hence, using the relation (4.36) and the above expressions, the equation (4.31) can be obtained by the relation $Z(0)=-(\frac{log\pi}{2}+\frac{\acute{\xi}(0)}{\xi(0)}+\frac{\gamma}{2}+1)$: ($\gamma$ is Euler's Constant).

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi(x) &= Li(x)-O(1)+\frac{Z(0)}{log2}-\frac{log(3/4)}{2log2}-\int_{2}^{x}\frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu}-\\
&\sum_{\gamma>0}\{Li(x^\rho)+Li(x^{1-\rho})\}-\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{\int_{2^\rho}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}-O(1)\}-\\
&\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{\int_{2^{1-\rho}}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}-O(1)\}=Li(x)+\frac{Z(0)}{log2}-\\
&\frac{log(3/4)}{2log2}+\int_{x}^{\infty}\frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu}-\int_{2}^{\infty}\frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu}-\\
&\sum_{\gamma>0}\{Li(x^\rho)+Li(x^{1-\rho})\}-\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{\int_{2^\rho}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}+\int_{2^{1-\rho}}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}\}+\\
&\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}O(1)=Li(x)-\sum_{\gamma>0}\{Li(x^\rho)+Li(x^{1-\rho})\}+\\
&\int_{x}^{\infty}\frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu}-\int_{2}^{\infty}\frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu}+\frac{Z(0)}{log2}-\frac{log(3/4)}{2log2}+
\end{aligned}$$

$$\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}O(1)=Li(x)-\sum_{\gamma>0}\{Li(x^{\rho})+Li(x^{1-\rho})\}+$$
$$\int_{x}^{\infty}\frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu}-3.7277log2 \qquad (4.41)$$

In the above relation, $3.7277log2$ is obtained by the following calculations:

$$-\int_{2}^{\infty}\frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu}-\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{\int_{2^{\rho}}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}+\int_{2^{1-\rho}}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}\}+\frac{Z(0)}{log2}-\frac{log(3/4)}{2log2}+$$
$$\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}O(1)\approx-0.14-\frac{(log(2\pi)+log(3/4))}{2log2}=-2.5839\approx-3.7277log2 \qquad (4.42)$$

In the above relations, we have:

$$-\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}\{\int_{2^{\rho}}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}+\int_{2^{1-\rho}}^{2}\frac{dw}{log^2w}\}+\lim_{T\longrightarrow\infty}\sum_{0<\gamma<T}O(1)=0$$
$$Z(0)=-\log(2\pi) \qquad (4.43)$$

This proves the relation (4.44):

$$\Pi(x)=Li(x)-\sum_{\gamma>0}\{Li(x^{\rho})+Li(x^{1-\rho})\}+\int_{x}^{\infty}\frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu}-3.7277log2 \qquad [37] \qquad (4.44)$$

4.2. The second section of the proof for $x=P^n$

From the relations (4.27) and (4.29) could be written:

$$\psi(x+0)=\psi_0(x)+\frac{1}{2}\Lambda(x) \qquad (4.45)$$
$$\psi(x-0)=\psi_0(x)-\frac{1}{2}\Lambda(x)$$

$$\Pi(x+0)=\frac{\psi(x+0)}{log(x)}+\int_2^{x+0}\frac{\psi(u)du}{ulog^2u}=$$
$$\frac{\psi_0(x)+\frac{1}{2}\Lambda(x)}{logx}+\int_2^{x}\frac{\psi(u+0)du}{ulog^2u}=$$
$$\frac{\psi_0(x)+\frac{1}{2}\Lambda(x)}{logx}+\int_2^{x}\frac{(\psi_0(u)+\frac{1}{2}\Lambda(u))du}{ulog^2u} \tag{4.46}$$

Also:

$$\Pi(x-0)=\frac{\psi(x-0)}{log(x)}+\int_2^{x-0}\frac{\psi(u)du}{ulog^2u}=$$
$$\frac{\psi_0(x)-\frac{1}{2}\Lambda(x)}{logx}+\int_2^{x}\frac{(\psi_0(u)-\frac{1}{2}\Lambda(u))du}{ulog^2u} \tag{4.47}$$

$$\Pi_0(x)=\Pi(x)=\frac{1}{2}[\Pi(x+0)+\Pi(x-0)]=$$
$$\frac{1}{2}\{\frac{2\psi_0(x)}{logx}+2\int_2^{x}\frac{\psi_0(u)du}{ulog^2u}\}=$$
$$\frac{\psi_0(x)}{logx}+\int_2^{x}\frac{\psi_0(u)du}{ulog^2u} \tag{4.48}$$

Using the relation (4.48), the relation (4.31) was validated.

Lemma 4.7

Let $\Pi(x)$ be a function defind by the relation (4.44),then $\pi(x)$ the number of primes less than or equal x is

$$\pi(x)=\sum_{r=1}^{\infty}\frac{\mu(r)}{r}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{r}}) \quad [37] \tag{4.49}$$

Proof:

We know that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mu(1)}{1}\Pi(x) = \Pi(x) &= \pi(x) + \frac{1}{2}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \frac{1}{3}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{3}}) + \frac{1}{4}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{4}}) + \dots \\
\frac{\mu(2)}{2}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \frac{-1}{2}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{2}}) &= -\frac{1}{2}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{2}}) - \frac{1}{4}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{4}}) - \frac{1}{6}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{6}}) + \dots \\
\frac{\mu(3)}{3}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{3}}) = \frac{-1}{3}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{3}}) &= -\frac{1}{3}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{3}}) - \frac{1}{6}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{6}}) - \frac{1}{9}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{9}}) + \dots \\
\frac{\mu(4)}{4}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{4}}) &= 0 \times \frac{1}{4}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{4}}) = 0 \\
\frac{\mu(5)}{5}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{5}}) = \frac{-1}{5}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{5}}) &= -\frac{1}{5}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{5}}) - \frac{1}{10}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{10}}) - \frac{1}{15}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{15}}) + \dots \\
\frac{\mu(6)}{6}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{6}}) = \frac{1}{6}\Pi(x^{\frac{1}{6}}) &= \frac{1}{6}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{6}}) + \frac{1}{12}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{12}}) + \frac{1}{18}\pi(x^{\frac{1}{18}}) + \dots \\
\vdots \quad \vdots = \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad &= \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots
\end{aligned} \tag{4.50}$$

By summing separately the right and left hand sides of the equations, the proof is completed. Therefore:

$$\pi(x) = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(r)}{r} \left\{ Li(x^{\frac{1}{r}}) - \sum_{\gamma>0} \{Li(x^{\frac{\rho}{r}}) + Li(x^{\frac{1-\rho}{r}})\} + \int_{x^{\frac{1}{r}}}^{\infty} \frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu} - 3.7277log2 \right\} \quad [37] \tag{4.51}$$

Lemma 4.8

Let the sum of the lengths of the intervals created by the function $\hat{h}(n)$ based on the Lemma 3.1 is denoted by $sum(n)$,then

$$sum(n) = n - 2\phi(n) - 2D(n) + 2\pi(n) + 2 \tag{4.52}$$

where $\phi(n)$ denotes the Euler's function.$D(n)$ denotes the number of the

prime factors of n. $\pi(n)$ denotes the number of primes less than or equal to n.These intervals are intervals if there is every prime as P relatively prime with respect to n, then $n - P$ will be a prime.

Proof:

Trivially,the number of relatively primes to n which are not primes is equal to

$$RP(n) = \phi(n) - 1 - [\pi(n) - D(n)] \tag{4.53}$$

If one establishes the relations based on the Lemma 3.1, i.e. at first, sort increasingly the product of the prime factors, which are both less than and relatively prime to n,then there will be an interval of length 2 for any product (as e.g.1).Therefore we able to write:

$$sum(n) = n - 2RP(n) = n - 2\{\phi(n) - 1 - [\pi(n) - D(n)]\} = \\ n - 2\phi(n) - 2D(n) + 2\pi(n) + 2 \tag{4.54}$$

and the Proof is completed. The function $sum(n)$ is used for the comparison of the number of the primes existing in the sum of the created intervals less than n with the number of the primes in a farther interval of the length $sum(n)$. For $n = 26$ can be written:

$$\phi(26) = 12, \quad D(26) = 2, \quad \pi(26) = 9 \Rightarrow sum(26) = 18$$

As seen, based on the example 1 of the Lemma 3.1, the sum of the desirable intervals is $8 + 4 + 4 + 2 = 18$ and equal to $sum(26)$.

Lemma 4.9 (Sabihi's Conjecture)

Let $m = g(N(k))$ be an integer function and $N(k) \geq 120$ be an even natural number and $N(k) = n - \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \prod_{i=1}^{i=m} (r_i^j)^{x_i} + f(k) - 1$ (referring to Lemma 3.1).k denotes the number of intervals which is called character or module of the function $\hat{h}(n)$ here. Consider the integer number function M so

$$M(N(k), m) = mN(k) + sum(N(k)) \tag{4.55}$$

Let

$$K(N(k), m) = \pi(M(N(k), m)) - \pi(mN(k)) \tag{4.56}$$

where

$$K(N(k), m) = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(r)}{r} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} Li((M(N(k), m))^{\frac{1}{r}}) - Li((mN(k))^{\frac{1}{r}}) + \\ \\ \sum_{\gamma>0} \left\{ Li((mN(k))^{\frac{\rho}{r}}) + Li((mN(k))^{\frac{1-\rho}{r}}) \right\} - \\ \\ \sum_{\gamma>0} \left\{ Li((M(N(k), m))^{\frac{\rho}{r}}) + Li((M(N(k), m))^{\frac{1-\rho}{r}}) \right\} + \\ \\ \int_{(M(N(k),m))^{\frac{1}{r}}}^{\infty} \frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu} - \int_{(mN(k))^{\frac{1}{r}}}^{\infty} \frac{du}{u(u^2-1)logu} \end{array} \right\} \tag{4.57}$$

and $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$

Let $L(N(k))$ *so:*

$$L(N(k)) = \pi(N(k)) - \pi(N(k) - (r_1^j)^2 + 1) + \sum_{k_{int}=1}^{RP(N(k))-1} [\pi(N(k) - \prod_{i=1}^{m_P}(r_i^j)^{x_i-1} - 1)_{k_{int}} - \pi(N(k) - \prod_{i=1}^{m_P}(r_i^j)^{x_i} + 1)_{k_{int}}] + \pi(N(k) - (r_{m_P}^j)^2 - 1) \quad (4.58)$$

where $L(N(k)$ *is the sum of the primes containing inside the sum of intervals created by the function* $N(k)$ *i.e* $sum(N(k))$.m_P *denotes the number of primes in a prime factor less than* $L(N(k)$. $\pi(N(k) - \prod_{i=1}^{m_P}(r_i^j)^{x_i-1} - 1)_{k_{int}} - \pi(N(k) - \prod_{i=1}^{m_P}(r_i^j)^{x_i} + 1)_{k_{int}}$ *denotes* k_{int}*-th interval of primes and* k_{int} *denotes the number of desirable intervals under* $L(N(k)$. $\prod_{i=1}^{m_P}(r_i^j)^{x_i-1}$ and $\prod_{i=1}^{m_P}(r_i^j)^{x_i}$ *denote increasingly sorted products of the prime factors which are less than* $L(N(k)$ *and* $\pi(N(k) - (r_{m_P}^j)^2 - 1)$ *is the number of primes in the last interval between number 1 and* $N(k) - (r_{m_P}^j)^2 - 1$.

If

$$L(N(k)) - D(N(k)) \geq K(N(k), m) \geq 2 \quad (4.59)$$

Then, the Goldbach's conjecture will be proved for the even numbers from 120 to infinity.In the particular case,$N(k) = n$.

Referring to the Lemma 3.1,one finds out that if $N(k) = n$,it will be sufficient for establishment of the Lemma i.e $L(n) - D(n) \geq K(n, m) \geq 2$

Note: This Lemma is indeed to compare the number of the primes existing

inside an interval which is equal to the sum of the lengths of the intervals created by $N(k)$(only for prime factor products relatively prime with respect to $N(k)$) with the number of the primes existing inside an interval of the same length in a farther distance from N(k).The number of the primes existing inside the sum of the lengths of the intervals created by $\hat{h}(n)$ minus $D(N(k))$ should be greater or equal to number of primes in the farther interval. It should also be proved that the number of the primes in the farther interval is ≥ 2.

Some experimental evidences: Based on the Lemma 4.8, the following examples for $n \geq 10000$ can be written:

$$\phi(10,000) = 4000, D(10,000) = 2, \pi(10,000) = 1229$$
$$sum(10,000) = 10000 - 2 \times 4000 + 2 \times 1229 - 2 \times 2 + 2 = 4456 \quad (4.60)$$

$$\phi(100,000) = 40000, D(100,000) = 2, \pi(100,000) = 9592$$
$$sum(100,000) = 100000 - 2 \times 40000 + 2 \times 9592 - 2 \times 2 + 2 = 39182 \quad (4.61)$$

$$\phi(1000,000) = 400000, D(1000,000) = 2, \pi(1000,000) = 78498$$
$$sum(1000,000) = 1000000 - 2 \times 400000 + 2 \times 78498 - 2 \times 2 + 2 = 356996 \quad (4.62)$$

It is seen that as far as $n > 10000$ then $sum(n)$ will be grown. Just suppose $n = 10000, m = n^2$ then based on the Lemma 4.9 we have:

$$M(10000, 10000^2) = 10000^2 \times 10000 + 4456 = 1000000004456 \quad (4.63)$$

From the relation (4.56) and by the software of computing, will be concluded:

$$K(10000, 10000^2) = \pi(M(10000, 10000^2)) - \pi(10000^2 \times 10000) = 154 \quad (4.64)$$

Also, by running the program:

$$L(10,000) = 256, D(10,000) = 2 \quad (4.65)$$

Therefore, based on the relation (4.59):

$$L(10000) - D(10000) > K(10000, 10000^2) > 2 \quad (4.66)$$

For example 1:

$$\begin{aligned} L(26) = \pi(26) - \pi(26 - 3^2 + 1) + \pi(26 - 3^2 - 1) - \pi(26 - 3 \times 5 + 1) + \\ \pi(26 - 3 \times 5 - 1) - \pi(26 - 3 \times 7 + 1) + \pi(26 - 3 \times 7 - 1) - \\ \pi(26 - 5^2 + 1) = 6 \end{aligned} \quad (4.67)$$

Therefore, the sum of the number of the primes containing in the desirable intervals of 26 is 6, but all of these primes may not be relatively prime with respect to 26, thus one must subtract them from $L(26)$. Because we do not know the exact number of the primes which divide a general number as n (here $n = 26$),we assume them to be $D(26)$. Therefore the inequality $L(26) - D(26) \geq K(26, m) \geq 2$ should be satisfied for a selected number as $m \geq 1$. The conjecture is only for even numbers greater than 120 but may also be true for some even numbers under 120. The above example is only a simple example for explanation of the Lemmas. One of the most important conclusions of this paper and the Lemma 4.9 is the following Lemma:

Lemma 4.10

The number of the primes n_g which contain in the created desirable intervals by the Lemma 3.1, constructs an inequality:

$$L(n) \geq n_g \geq L(n) - D(n) \tag{4.68}$$

These primes are consisted of twin primes which the sum of each twin prime is equal to n. Therefore the number of the twins n_{twing} satisfies the following inequality:

$$\frac{L(n)}{2} \geq n_{twing} \geq \frac{L(n) - D(n)}{2} \tag{4.69}$$

5. THE COMPUTATIONAL PROGRAMS OF THE SABIHI's CONJECTURE BY MAPLE8 AND MATLAB R2006a SOFTWARES FOR THE EVEN NUMBERS FROM 120 TO 100,000

5.1. ***The Flowchart of the Programs***

5.2. ***The Maple8's Program***


Start the Program
Take the Even Numbers from
$n = 120$ to $Kf = 100000$
Get the Number of the Evens
Nt


Take the First Column of the Vectors
To One, $K = 1$
(1)
Get arrays Sl, Sp, Spn, Knm According to Nt
(2)
Start the Loop For Numbers 120 to 100000
$j = 1$
$Sl[k] = 0$
$Sp[k] = 0$
$Spn[k] = 0$
Get arrays N and NP
$mn = 1$
End
No
Yes
(3)
If $C = Nt$
Yes
No
Print "The conjecture is true for the all Numbers"
Print "The conjecture is not true for the all Numbers"
Print Vectors Sl, Sp, Knm
End Maple's Program
Start Matlab's Program
Plot Vectors Sl, Sp, Knm
End Matlab's Program


Get the Number of Non-Primes (j) That are Relatively Prime To nl (3)
$Np[j] = N[i]$
$j = j + 1$
Start the Loop for the Numbers $2 \le i \le nl$ (4)
$Spn[k] = Spn[k] + 1$
$mn = mn \times (1 - 1/N[i])$
Yes
(5)
If $\gcd(N[i], nl) > 1$ And $N[i]$ is a Prime
No
Fill Vector $N[i]$
Yes
If $\gcd(N[i], nl) = 1$ And $N[i]$ is not a Prime
(5)
No
End
Yes
$j = j - 1$
Start the Loop For Intervals $1 to\ j - 1$
No
End
Compute Sl and Sp
Yes
(6)


The Last Intervals Of Sl and Sp are Added
(6)
Compute Sp[k]−Spn[k]
m = nl²
M = m.nl
Compute Knm
If
2 ≤ Knm ≤ Sp[k]−Spn[k]
Yes
No
C = C+1
(7)
Print
" ********** "
(7)
Compute Pn
Compute fin
Compute
k = k+1
(2)

1- Restart:

2- $n := 120;$

3- $kf := 100000;$

4- $Nt := (kf - n)/2 + 1;$

5- $C := 0;$

6- $k := 1;$

7- $Sl := array(1..Nt);$

8- $Sp := array(1..Nt);$

9- $Spn := array(1..Nt);$

10- $Knm := array(1..Nt);$

11- $sumn := array(1..Nt);$

12- $for \;\; nl \;\; from \;\; n \;\; by \;\; 2 \;\; to \;\; kf \;\; do$

13- $j := 1;$

14- $Sl[k] := 0;$

15- $Sp[k] := 0;$

16- $Spn[k] := 0;$

17- $N := array(2..nl);$

18- $NP := array(1..nl);$

19- $mn := 1;$

20- $for \;\; i \;\; from \;\; 2 \;\; to \;\; nl \;\; do$

21- $N[i] := i;$

22- $if(gcd(N[i], nl) = 1 \;\; and \;\; not \;\; isprime(N[i]))$

23- $then \;\; NP[j] := N[i]; j := j + 1;$

24- $end \;\; if;$

25- $if(gcd(N[i], nl) > 1 \;\; and \;\; isprime(N[i]))$

26- $then \;\; Spn[k] := Spn[k] + 1; mn := mn * (1 - 1/N[i]);$

27- $end \;\; if;$

28- $end \;\; do;$

29- $j := j - 1;$

30- $for \;\; ms \;\; from \;\; 1 \;\; to \;\; (j-1) do$

31- $NP[ms] := NP[ms];$

32- $Sl[k] := Sl[k] + (nl - NP[ms] - 1) - (nl - NP[ms + 1] + 1);$

33- $Sp[k] := Sp[k] + nops(select(isprime, [\$(nl - NP[ms + 1] + 1)..(nl - NP[ms] - 1)]));$

34- $end \;\; do;$

35- $Sl[k] := Sl[k] + nl - (nl - NP[1] + 1) + (nl - NP[j] - 1);$

36- $Sp[k] := Sp[k] + nops(select(isprime, [\$(nl - NP[1] + 1)..(nl)])) + nops(select(isprime, [\$(nl - NP[j] - 1)..1]));$

37- $Sp[k] := Sp[k] - Spn[k];$

38- $m := nl^2;$

39- $M := m * nl;$

40- $Knm[k] := nops(select(isprime, [\$(M)..(M + Sl[k])]));$

41- $if(Knm[k] <= Sp[k] \;\; and \;\; Knm[k] >= 2) \;\; then \;\; C := C+1; else \;\; print("* * * *

48- $if(C = (Nt))\ then\ print(\text{"}The\ Conjecture\ is\ true\ for\ the\ all\ numbers\text{"})$;

49- $else\ print(\text{"}The\ Conjecture\ is\ not\ true\ for\ the\ all\ numbers\text{"})$;

50- $end\ \ if$;

51- $print(Sl)$;

52- $print(Sp)$;

53- $print(Knm)$;

The above program has been executed by the Maple 8's software. This program has been written based on the Lemmas 4.8 and 4.9. It has proved and confirmed the Sabihi's conjecture (Lemma 4.9) and the Lemma 4.8 for the even numbers 120 to 100000 with $m = n^2$. It also shows that this conjecture should be true for the even numbers greater than 100,000 to infinity for $m \geq n^2$.This means that as far as n increases for various intervals of the greater than 100,000, the value of m might be $n^2, n^3, \ldots$.At the above program, the following symbols are explained:

mn denotes the product of the factors as $(1 - \frac{1}{P})$ so that P denotes a prime number and divides n.Sl denotes the sum of the desirable intervals less than n and its value is compared with $sumn$ where denotes the function $sum(n)$ in the Lemma 4.8.Sp denotes the sum of the primes existed inside the desirable intervals (Sl) where denotes the function $L(n)$ in the Lemma 4.9.Spn denotes the number of the primes which divides n and denotes $D(n)$. Knm denotes the function $K(n, m)$ of the Lemma 4.9.Pn denotes $\pi(n)$. The lines 32, 33, 35, and 36 compute $sum(n)$ and $L(n)$ .The line 37 computes $L(n) - D(n)$. The line 41 evaluates the conjecture.

Study on the variations $sum(n)$,$L(n) - D(n)$,and $K(n, m)$ versus n shows that whenever the value of $sum(n)$ increases/decreases then the values of

$L(n) - D(n)$ and $K(n, m)$ will increase/decrease (see Figs.2 to 9).Therefore $L(n) - D(n)$ and $K(n, m)$ oscillate about a curve line where increases continuously by augmentation in n. This study also shows that this conjecture should be true for the even numbers 120 to infinity. The processing results of the Maple's program i.e. the vectors Sl, Sp, and Knm for the even numbers 120 to 20000 have been copied and pasted into the vectors of the following Matlab's program.The data contained many volume so that the computer was not able to draw plots for numbers more than 20000. By this reason, we had to be satisfied with same given data. The plots have then been drawn (Figs.2 to 9). The plots show a mean augmentation in the Sl,Sp,and Knm functions versus an augmentation in n.

5.3. ***The Matlab R2006a's Program***

clear all($rolp$); clc

$n = 120;$

$nf = 100000;$

$k = (nf - n)/2 + 1$

$for \;\; i = 1 : k$

$x(i) = n$

$n = n + 2$

$end;$

$Sumn = [\;\;];$

$plot(x,\; Sumn,\; '*'\;\;,\; 'linewidth'\;, 0.1);\; grid\;\; on$

$Knm = [\;\;];$

$Sp = [\;\;];$

$plot(x,\; Knm,\; '*'\;\;, x,\; Sp,\; '.'\;,\; 'linewidth'\;, 0.1); grid\;\; on$

5.4. ***The Plots of the Programs for Evens 120 to 20000***

The following figures are listed and represented respectively:

Fig.2. The function $sum(n)$ versus n for the evens 120 to 1000.

Fig.3. The function $L(n) - D(n)$ and $K(n, m)$ versus n for the evens 120 to 1000.

Fig.4. The function $sum(n)$ versus n for the evens 1002 to 5000.

Fig.5. The function $L(n) - D(n)$ and $K(n, m)$ versus n for the evens 1002 to 5000.

Fig.6. The function $sum(n)$ versus n for the evens 5002 to 10000.

Fig.7. The function $L(n) - D(n)$ and $K(n, m)$ versus n for the evens 5002 to 10000.

Fig.8. The function $sum(n)$ versus n for the evens 10002 to 20000.

Fig.9. The function $L(n) - D(n)$ and $K(n, m)$ versus n for the evens 10002 to 20000.


900
800
700
600
500
400
300
200
100
0
sum(n)
100
200
300
400
500
600
700
800
900
1000
n


K(n,m)
L(n)-D(n)
120
100
80
60
40
20
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
700
800
900
1000
n


4500
4000
3500
3000
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
sum(n)
1000
1500
2000
2500
3000
3500
4000
4500
5000
n


K(n,m)
L(n)-D(n)
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
1000
1500
2000
2500
3000
3500
4000
4500
5000
n


8000
7000
6000
5000
4000
3000
2000
1000
sum(n)
5000
5500
6000
6500
7000
7500
8000
8500
9000
9500
10000
n


K(n,m)
L(n)-D(n)
700
600
500
400
300
200
100
0
5000
5500
6000
6500
7000
7500
8000
8500
9000
9500
10000
n


16000
14000
12000
10000
8000
6000
4000
2000
sum(n)
1
1.1
1.2
1.3
1.4
1.5
1.6
1.7
1.8
1.9
2
n
x 10^4


K(n,m)
L(n)-D(n)
1200
1000
800
600
400
200
0
1
1.1
1.2
1.3
1.4
1.5
1.6
1.7
1.8
1.9
2
n
x 10^4

CONCLUSIONS

By investigation about the more methods cited in the literature survey, we found a new method using Riemann zeta-function,$\pi(x)$, and some elementary Theorems and Lemmas in number theory. Making a precise proof for the Lemma 4.9, we are able to claim that Goldbach's conjecture could be proved. This is due to finding at least two primes in one of the intervals mentioned in the Lemma 3.1 or equivalently in the relation (4.58) and is also concluded that there exists a one to one and identity function onto $n \longrightarrow n$. Hence,one of the second members of subset mentioned in the Lemma 2.2 will be a prime. This proves the Goldbach's conjecture completely.

It is mentionable that our methods were not based on the ordinary present methods as Circle method, Sieve method,and etc. Obviously, the proof of the Lemma 4.9 precisely and analytically may be difficult and we are not able to claim when it shall be solved in future, but we are trying to make an absolutely analytical proof of our conjecture. This proof will come in another paper in future that will completely prove the Sabihi's conjecture. We gave the experimental evidence by computer analysis that would indicate that the Lemma 4.9 (Sabihi's Conjecture) is true for the even numbers 120 to 100,000 and might be true for the even numbers greater than 100,000. This experimental evidence has been shown by running the computational programs of Maple8 and MatlabR2006a's softwares. The flowchart of the programs was also drawn. The plots have been drawn only for the even numbers 120 to 20,000 due to many volume of data. The volume of data for the evens greater than 20,000 was so many that we were not able to run them,but same data

showed that the conjecture should be true.

By proving the Lemma 4.9,one is able to claim that for every even number as n(e.g.$n \geq 120$) the Goldbach's conjecture is true. Certainly, the Goldbach's conjecture is true for $n \leq 120$, therefore the Goldbach's conjecture should be established for all even integers greater than 2.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the Editor-in-Chief, Prof. H.M. Srivastava and anonymous Referees of the Allahabad Mathematical Society for nice comments on the manuscript.

References

[1] Jörg Richstein "*Verifying the Goldbach conjecture up to* 4×10^{14} "J. Math. Comp. 70 (2001), pp. 1745-1749

[2] I.G.van der Corput"*Sur l'hypothe'se de Goldbach pour Presque tous les nombres paires*"Acta Arith.2(1937),pp.266-290.

[3] R.C.Vaughan"*On Goldbach's problems*"Acta Arith.22 (1972),pp.21-48.MR.45 123.

[4] P.Tur'an"*On the twin prime problem III*"Acta Arith.14(1968),pp.399-407.MR.15 123.

[5] L.E.Dickson, *History of the theory of numbers*,(three volumes) Carnegie Inst., Washington, (1919,1920,1923).

[6] Shen Mok Kong,*On checking the Goldbach conjecture*,Nordisk Tidskr.Imfor. Behand;4(1964) pp.243-345.

[7] W.A.Light,T.J.Forres,N.Hammond and S.Roe,"*A note on Goldbach's conjecture*",BIT;20(1980) pp.525.

[8] E.Landau "*Gelöste und ungelöste probleme aus der Theorie der Primzahle-verteilung und der Riemannschen Zatefunktion* "Proc. 5th Intern. Congr. Math. ;Cam. ,1(1912)pp. 93-108.

[9] G.H.Hardy"*Goldbach's theorem*"Math.Tid.,B(1922)pp.1-16.

[10] *Collected papers of G.H.Hardy*,Vol.I,Oxford,Clarendon Press(1966).

[11] G.H.Hardy, J.E.Littlewood "*A new solution of Waring's problem*"Göt. Nach; (1920) pp. 33-54.

[12] Viggo Brun"*Le crible d'Ertosthe'ne et le the'oreme de Goldbach*"C.R.Acad.Sci .,Paris,168(1919)pp.544-546.

[13] Viggo Brun"*Le crible d'Ertosthe'ne et le the'oreme de Goldbach*"Skr.Norske Vid.Akad, Kristiania,I;3(1920)pp.1-36.

[14] L.G.Schnirelmann "*Über additive Eigenschaften von Zahlen* "Izv. Donck. Polytech. Inst.,14 (1930) pp. 3-28.

[15] M.Vinogradov "*Representation of an odd number as a sum of three primes* "Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR; 15 (1937)pp. 291-294.

[16] Chen Jing Run"*On the representation of a large even integer as the sum of a prime and the product of at most two primes*"Kexue Tongbao;17(1966)pp.385-386.

[17] Chen Jing Run"*On the representation of a large even integer as the sum of a prime and the product of at most two primes*"Sci.Sinica; 16(1973)pp.157-176;(II)ibid.21(1978)pp.421-430.

[18] G.H.Hardy, S.Ramanujan "*Asymptotic formula in combinatory analysis* "Proc. London Math. Soc., 17(1918) pp. 75-115.

[19] Ju.V.Linnik "*A new proof of the Vinogradov-Goldbach theorem* "Mat. Sbornik; 19 (1946) pp. 3-8.

[20] Ju.V.Linnik"*Some conditional theorems concerning binary problems with prime numbers*"Dokl.Akad.Nauk SSSR;77(1951)pp.15-18.

[21] Ju.V.Linnik "*Prime numbers and powers of two* "Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov; 38 (1951) pp. 152-169.

[22] Ju.V.Linnik"*Some conditional theorems concerning binary Goldbach problem*" Ixv.Akad.Nauk SSSR,Ser.Mat.,16(1952)pp.503-530.

[23] I.M.Vinogradov "*Sur le th'eorem'e Waring* "Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Mat., (1928) pp. 393-400.

[24] P.X.Gallgher"*Primes and powes of 2*"Inv.Math.,29(1975)pp.125-142.

[25] I.K'atai"*A comment on a paper of Yu.V.Linnik*"Magyer Tud.Akad.Mat.Fiz.Oszt. Közl;17(1967)pp.99-100.

[26] H.L.Montgomery,R.C.Vaughan" *The exceptional set in Goldbach's problem*"Acta Arith., 27(1975)pp.353-370.

[27] Wang Yuan " *On Linnik's method concerning the Goldbach number* "Sci. Sinica; 20 (1977) pp. 16-30.

[28] K.Prachar " *Über die Anwendung einer Methode von Linnik* "Acta Arith., 29 (1976) pp. 367-376

[29] Pan Chen Dong,*On Goldbach number*,Kexue Tongbao,The special series of Math.Phy.and Chem.(1980).

[30] Lu Ming Gao"*On the Goldbach number*" Science in China Series A,27(1984),pp.242-252

[31] Wang Yuan,Shan Zun"*A conditional result on Goldbach problem*" Acta Math.Sin.,New Ser., 1(1985) pp.72-78.

[32] Dimitrii Zinoviev " *On Vinogradov's Constant in Goldbach's Ternary Problem* "J.Number Theory 65 (1997) pp. 334-358

[33] R.Balasubramanian,C.J.Mozzochi " *Siegel zeros and the Goldbach problem* "J.Number Theory 16 (1983) pp. 311-332

[34] S.Sirinivasan,"*A remark on Goldbach's problem*"J.Number Theory 12(1980)pp.116-121

[35] Serge Lang,*Algebraic Number Theory*,Springer-Verlag,New York (1986).

[36] William and Fern Ellison,*Prime Numbers*, Wiley-Interscience,a division of John Wiley and Sons.Inc.New York (1985).

[37] Ahmad Sabihi,"*A Novel Explicit Formula for Computing* $\pi(x)$ *the Number of Primes* $\leq x$"Int.Journal of Math.Analysis 3(2009)pp.1893-1903